

REMARKS

Claims 2-9 and 11-19 are pending in the application, claims 18 and 19 having been amended herein. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

SPECIFICATION

The Examiner objects to the title as not descriptive and too general. This rejection is respectfully traversed. However, in the interest of expediting prosecution Applicants have amended the title as detailed above. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are respectfully requested. If the objection to the title is still maintained, Applicants invite the Examiner to suggest a proposed title as provided for in MPEP 606.01.

The Examiner also objects to the specification for failing to describe "electrical isolation of the terminal receiving region from the contact spring and housing has not been described as recited in claims [sic] 18, of the terminal end within the block as recited in claim 9 or within the terminal receiving region as recited in claim 19." This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The specification as originally filed includes numerous references to these aspects of the claimed invention. In particular, Applicants direct the Examiner's attention to the following portions of the specification:

¶0004	The electrical connection includes an isolator or spacer block having a first bore and a spring. The spring has a fixed portion attached to the isolator and has a resilient portion extending into the first bore. A housing retains the spacer block, wherein the fixed portion is in pressed contact with an internal surface of the housing.
-------	--

¶0015	A cover 16 is selectively fixed to the housing shell 12 to cover the cavity 14 and may include a seal (not shown) to provide a sealed environment.
¶0024	Assembly of the cable 20 into the cable housing 10 is a simple plug-in connection, which establishes a shielded connection between the cable 20 and the housing shell 12.
Abstract	A shielded cable assembly that receives a shielded cable therein and includes an isolator or spacer block having a bore and a spring having a fixed portion disposed about the isolator and a resilient portion extending into the bore. A housing retains the isolator and receives the shielded cable.
Claims 8, 17	said spacer block is formed of an electrically non-conductive material

Of particular note is the use of the term "isolator" as synonymous with the term "spacer block." In the technical field of the present invention, the term isolate refers to electrical isolation. See, e.g., McGraw-Hill Dictionary of Scientific and Technical Terms, 6th Ed., 2003, isolate: [elec] to disconnect a circuit of piece of equipment from an electrical supply. From the foregoing, Applicants submit that the Examiner's objection is unfounded and urge the Examiner to withdraw this rejection.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

The claims stand rejected to for certain informalities. The Examiner has noted certain occurrences in claims 9, 18 and 19 where the indefinite article "a" should be replaced with the definite article "the." With respect to claim 9, Applicants submit the first occurrence of "a" in line 8 is the first time that the limitation "a cable" is introduced in the claim. Thus, use of the indefinite article is believed to be appropriate. With respect to claim 18, Applicants submit that the noted occurrences relate to the structural configuration of the second bore and the contact spring. As such Applicants are not claiming a cable (or its shielding) *per se* but rather the configuration of the electrical

connector receives the terminal end of a cable and provides electrical continuity therebetween. With this understanding of the claimed subject matter, Applicants have amended claim 18 include the definite article "the" as suggested by the Examiner to claimed connectors suitability for use with a cable. In contrast, Applicants have used the definite article "said" to reference a positively recited limitation in the claim. With respect to claim 19, Applicants have amended the claim to remove the first occurrence "a" in line 6, thereby making the noted occurrence of "a" in line 9 to be the first time that the limitation "a cable" is introduced in the claim. In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the objections to the claims.

PRIOR ART REJECTIONS

Claims 18, 2-5, 9, 11-14 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Nelson (U.S. Patent No. 6386915). Claims 6-8 and 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Swearingen et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 2004/0003498)¹. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

While Nelson is directed to a connector for a coaxial cable, it does not disclose the structure of the present invention recited in the claims. Specifically, Nelson discloses a connector having a backnut (2) that mates with a body (5) to capture the end of the coaxial cable. However, the connector, and in particular the backnut, does electrically isolate the connector. In fact, the backnut, the body and the shielding (3) are electrically coupled for shielding for the inner connector which is isolated by the foam of

¹ The Office Action inadvertently identified the cited reference as 2004/0003398 but the PTO-892 correctly identified the cited reference as 2004/0003498.

the coaxial cable disposed over the inner conductor. In contrast, the claimed invention recites a spacer block having a terminal receiving region electrically isolated from the contact spring and the housing. Thus, the claimed connector utilizes the spacer block as an isolator between the terminal end and the housing. With a better understanding of these differences, it becomes clear that Nelson does not teach or suggest the invention as recited in the pending claims.

Swearingen does resolve the deficiencies of Nelson noted above. Specifically, Applicants submit that Swearingen fails to teach or suggest a contact spring having a fixed portion interposed between the spacer block and the housing and a resilient portion extending into the spacer block bore to provide electrical continuity with the housing. Furthermore, Swearingen fails to disclose or suggest a connector which electrical isolates the terminal end (i.e. the pin 80) and the contact (i.e., strips 24). Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION


It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the

Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 17, 2005

By:


David A. McClaughry
Reg. No. 37,885

HARNESS, DICKY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600